

Appl. No. 09/680,776

Amdt. Dated April 12, 2005

Reply to Office Action of January 12, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 3-9, and 11-20 remain in this application. Claims 1, 6, and 14 are amended. No new matter is added by the amendments to the claims.

CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103

At page 3 of this Office Action, claims 1 and 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,466,235 ("Smith"). Applicants submit that amended claim 1 and claims 3-5 are not anticipated by Smith because Smith does not disclose all of the elements of Applicants' claimed invention.

Smith discloses a multi-functional avionics display where the display is divided into quadrants and a pop-up menu of available instrument functions to be displayed is provided for each quadrant and accessible therein. A pilot can select an available instrument function for display in the corresponding quadrant. The available options in the upper right-hand quadrant pop-up menu and the lower right-hand quadrant pop-up menu are the same other than their respective location on the display (see Col. 4, lines 13-22). If an FMS initialization function is selected from the menu, the FMS initialization function is displayed in full view at the right-hand half side as a default display feature (see Col. 4, lines 27-52).

Claim 1 is amended to recite "wherein the monitors display the information on a plurality of panels, wherein each of the plurality of panels is configured to display a display content, the display content pre-assigned to a subset of sizes of the limited set of sizes based on a pre-determined flight condition priority, and wherein each of the plurality of panels is configured to be located on the avionics display based on the pre-determined flight condition priority [emphasis added]".

Appl. No. 09/680,776

Amdt. Dated April 12, 2005

Reply to Office Action of January 12, 2005

Applicants submit that Smith simply does not teach or suggest display content that is pre-assigned to a subset of sizes based on a pre-determined flight condition priority.

In contrast with amended claim 1, Smith does not teach or suggest location of the panels based on a pre-assignment of display content and a pre-determined flight condition priority. While it is hypothetically possible that computer codes of the display disclosed by Smith may pre-determine specific locations and sizes for the display panels as specifically shown in FIGS. 1-10 of Smith, this is not analogous to pre-assigning display content to a subset of panel sizes. Nothing in Smith addresses pre-assigning display content to a subset of panel sizes. In fact, Smith discloses substituting one selected instrument function into the display section of another instrument function which at best implies that no pre-assignment of display content occurs or that a single panel size is used regardless of display content, neither of which is pre-assigning display content to a subset of panel sizes. Further, Smith is not concerned with relating display content with pre-assigned sizes based on a pre-determined flight condition priority or with panel location based on the pre-determined flight condition priority.

Applicants submit that because of the foregoing patentable differences between amended claim 1 and Smith and because claims 3-5 depend from claim 1 or an intermediate claim depending therefrom, Applicants submit that claims 3-5 are likewise patentably distinguished from Smith. Because of the foregoing discussion regarding the patentability of claim 1 and because claims 3-5 depend from claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Smith, either alone or in combination with the cited references, does not obviate claims 1 and 3-5.

At page 7 of this Office Action, claims 6 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith in view of Briffe et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,112,141 ("Briffe"). Applicants

Appl. No. 09/680,776

Amdt. Dated April 12, 2005

Reply to Office Action of January 12, 2005

submit that claims 6 and 13 are not obviated by Smith in view of Briffe because none of the cited references, either alone or in combination, disclose or suggest all of the elements of Applicants' invention.

Claim 6 is amended to recite "wherein each of the plurality of panels is configured to display a display content, the display content pre-assigned to a subset of sizes of the limited set of sizes based on a pre-determined flight condition priority, and wherein each of the plurality of panels is configured to be located on the display based on the pre-determined flight condition priority [emphasis added]." From the previous discussion regarding amended claim 1, Applicants submit that Smith, either alone or in combination with the cited references, does not teach or suggest relating display content with pre-assigned sizes based on a pre-determined priority or with panel location based on the pre-determined priority.

Because amended claim 6 is patentably distinguished from Smith and Briffe and because claim 13 depends from claim 6, Applicants submit that claim 13 is likewise patentably distinguished from the combination of Smith and Briffe.

At page 9 of this Office Action, claims 7-8, 11-12, and 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith in view of Briffe as applied to claims 6 and 13, and further in view of Factor, U.S. Patent No. 6,281,810 ("Factor"). From the foregoing discussion regarding the patentability of claims 1 and 6 and because claims 7-8 and 11-12 depend from claim 6 or an intermediate claim depending therefrom, Applicants submit that claims 7-8 and 11-12 are likewise patentably distinguished from Smith, Briffe, and Factor, either alone or in combination. Applicants further submit that claims 14-19 are patentably distinguished from the cited references.

Appl. No. 09/680,776

Amdt. Dated April 12, 2005

Reply to Office Action of January 12, 2005

Claim 14 is amended to recite "wherein each of the plurality of monitors is configured to display the information on a plurality of panels, at least one of the plurality of panels is selectively configurable to have a size selected from a limited set of non-user defined sizes, wherein each of the sets of information is pre-assigned to a subset of sizes of the limited set of sizes based on a pre-determined flight condition priority, and wherein each of the plurality of panels is configured to be located on the monitor based on the pre-determined flight condition priority [emphasis added]".

Factor does not teach or suggest pre-assigning a subset of sizes for each display content based on a pre-determined priority. Additionally, Factor makes no mention of locating panels based on the pre-determined priority.

Because none of the cited references discloses the aforementioned features of amended claim 14, Applicants submit that the combination of Factor with Smith and Briffe does not result in Applicants' invention. From the foregoing discussion regarding the patentability of claim 14 and because claims 15-19 depend from claim 14, Applicants submit that claims 15-19 are likewise patentably distinguished from the combination of Smith, Briffe, and Factor.

At page 12 of this Office Action, claims 9 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith in view of Briffe as applied to claims 6 and 13, and further in view of Factor as applied to claims 7-8, 11-12, and 14-19, and further in view of Nakajima et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0055029 ("Nakajima"). Nakajima, either alone or in combination with Smith in view of Briffe and further in view of Factor, does not teach or suggest relating display content with pre-assigned sizes based on a pre-determined flight condition priority or with panel location based on the pre-determined flight condition priority.

Appl. No. 09/680,776

Amdt. Dated April 12, 2005

Reply to Office Action of January 12, 2005

From the foregoing discussion regarding the patentability of claim 6 and 14 and because claim 9 depends from an intermediate claim depending from claim 6 and claim 20 depends from claim 14, Applicants submit that claims 9 and 20 are likewise patentably distinguished from Smith, Briffe, Factor, and Nakajima, either alone or in combination.

CONCLUSION

In view of Applicants' remarks, it is respectfully submitted that Examiner's rejections under 35 USC §103 have been overcome. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject application is in condition for allowance, and such allowance is therefore earnestly requested. Should the Examiner have any questions or wish to further discuss this application, Applicants request that the Examiner contact the Applicants' attorneys at 480-385-5060.


If for some reason Applicants have not requested a sufficient extension and/or have not paid a sufficient fee for this response and/or for the extension necessary to prevent abandonment on this application, please consider this as a request for an extension for the required time period and/or authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ, P.C.

Dated: April 12, 2005

By:


Andrew Y. Pang
Reg. No. 40,1144
(480) 385-5060